Forthcoming chapter in Fili et al. (eds.) *Criminal Justice Research in an Era of Mass Mobility* (Routledge, 2018)

Making sense of the shifting 'field': Ethical and practical considerations in researching life after immigration detention

Sarah Turnbull, School of Law, Birkbeck, University of London, sarah.turnbull@bbk.ac.uk

> I've missed and avoided lots of calls from [Brent]. I speak to him today, although with his accent and the connection it's hard to catch everything he says. He's in [the Caribbean]. He says he's living in the bush above the houses in the city, eating mangos off the trees. He says his mind isn't working well, that he's been off his medication (antidepressants?) and that he's feeling down. [Brent] talks about his friends abandoning him, that he can't trust anyone. He begs me not to stop taking his calls. [Brent] sounds really down. He says his niece (or his niece's friend?) was killed recently. He says his mom needs him to help her as she's getting old and her place is falling apart but he can't even take care of himself. He says he thinks he'd be better off in prison. [Brent] talks about trying to stay positive and hopes that god will take care of him and give him a second chance. He says he can't believe how he wasn't given a chance to prepare to leave the UK, just made to go from detention… It's hard to know what to say to [Brent], so I say that I'm sorry he's going through this, that I hope things get better soon. What else can I say? (Fieldnotes, 2 March 2015)

This excerpt from my fieldnotes followed a telephone conversation with a research participant who had been deported to the Caribbean and was left destitute, suffering both the loss of his life in the United Kingdom (UK) after ten years of residence and his new, dire situation in the Caribbean island of his birth. It hints at some of the ethical, methodological, and practical challenges of doing follow-up research with individuals who have been released from detention into the UK or forcibly removed, as in Brent's case. More specifically, in addition to revealing

a bit about what life after deportation was like for him, the excerpt evinces my reaction as a researcher: my emotional distress and fatigue, the poor telephone connection, my concern as to his vulnerability, and my feelings of helplessness at not knowing what to say.

Criminologists have tended to play down the importance of the difficulties of doing research and our chosen methodologies in our publications or conferences (but see, e.g., Bosworth and Kellezi 2017; Phillips and Earle 2010; Phillips 2012; Lumsden and Winter 2014; Wakeman 2014). Other disciplinary fields, particularly those that draw on qualitative, feminist, and antiracist epistemologies and methodologies, are far more nuanced and critical in terms of these issues, tackling concerns around power, positionality, reflexivity, identity, representation, and so forth (e.g., Coutin and Vogel 2016; Faria and Mollett 2016; England 1994; Jazeel and McFarlane 2010). Yet, such conversations and dialogues are important for criminology, particularly for moving us beyond simplistic, positivist, disembodied accounts of research methodologies that disregard the complexities and messiness of projects involving human beings and the highly politicised and emotionally difficult environments in which much of this work takes place. Such contexts necessitate an openness to speak to both the challenges and opportunities of research, how we put ethics into practice 'on the ground' when we are in 'the field' (Darling 2014), and how our identities and positionalities shape academic knowledge production (McCorkel and Myers 2003; Jazeel and McFarlane 2010; Wakeman 2014).

The aim of this chapter is to offer a critical discussion of, and reflection upon, some of the challenges and opportunities of doing community-based and remote (i.e., via telephone and new media) follow-up research as part of a larger study of immigration detention and deportation in the UK. I draw on my experiences of conducting follow-up research with women and men that I first met during fieldwork in four immigration removal centres (IRCs) in the UK (see Turnbull, forthcoming; Turnbull 2016; Turnbull and Hasselberg, 2017; Bosworth and Turnbull 2015) and who were subsequently released, either into the British community or

returned to another country. Undertaking research with a follow-up component required establishing solid relationships with participants during the in-detention phase of the fieldwork so that they would continue past release and into daily life, whether this was in the UK or abroad. As this chapter will illustrate, building—and then maintaining—such relationships, however, was challenging because it required balancing the research aims with ethical concerns, logistical challenges, and the 'intimacies' that frequently accompany these interpersonal relationships, in navigating across various gender, racial, cultural, religious, national, and linguistic differences.

This chapter considers the following questions: How do researcher-participant relationships, with their attendant power relations and positionalities, play out when researching life after immigration detention? How can sustainable and ethical relationships be forged and maintained over time to allow for a follow-up research component? I do not aim to offer solutions to these questions or the challenges of ethics, emotions, or interpersonal relationships, but rather to give critical consideration to the messiness of such research and encourage ongoing dialogue and discussion. By 'messiness' I mean the contradictions, difficulties, opportunities, and emotions that inhere in the process of doing social science research.

A word on 'the field' of research is first necessary. Immigration detention and deportation are highly politicised policies and practices. Research access to study immigration detention is extremely limited if not precluded entirely (Bosworth 2014; Maillet et al. 2017). This research project was conducted during a time in which the broader political context was explicitly focused on creating a 'hostile environment' for migrants (Jones et al. 2015). Additionally, those who are subject to detention and deportation are, for the most part, marginalised in terms of their legal standing, racial and ethnic identities, and socioeconomic status. Immigration detention itself also produces vulnerability, exacerbating pre-existing conditions and/or creating new ones (e.g., mental or physical health issues) (see Bosworth 2016). This

marginality and vulnerability typically continues once detention formally ends through release to the community on temporary admission or immigration bail or deportation to another country. For those who remain, the daily lived experience of 'deportability' (De Genova 2002) is difficult as their lives remain precarious and uncertain (see, e.g., Williams 2015; Hasselberg 2016; Turnbull 2016). Those who have been deported face a variety of challenges, ranging from being returned destitute to war-torn countries (e.g., Schuster and Majidi 2013) to experiencing the stigmatisation of their migration failures (e.g., Golash-Boza 2015).

However, following Maillet and colleagues (2017: 929), it is important to complicate notions of vulnerability, recognising that 'people enter and exit varying degrees of vulnerability and precarity at different times and in different places.' This conceptualisation includes the researcher in addition to the research participants (Maillet et al. 2017; Drozdzewski and Dominey-Howes 2015). As Darling (2014: 211) astutely observes, '[c]ontext and positionality are always shifting beneath our feet as research develops, relationships grow and recede and the lives of those we work with move on around us.' The field of research is dynamic and changing, necessitating decisions and choices that influence the research project and the data that are gathered and analysed. Research is much messier than most methodology books allow us to believe. This messiness brings with it challenges, but also affords opportunities for innovation, critical reflection, and advancing knowledge and understanding. In the context of the emerging field of the criminology of mobility (Aas and Bosworth 2013) and the highly politicised nature of immigration control, such conversations are timely and important.

This chapter is organised into three main sections. The first provides some background information about the methods and data upon which the chapter is based. The second section outlines three interrelated challenges—indicative of the messiness of social research—that I encountered during the follow-up phase of the study. In the third section, I further situate the

challenges in terms of my affective experiences as researcher, while also identifying opportunities that research on life after immigration detention may afford.

Method and data: Understanding life after detention

One of the goals of my research was to understand what happens to people once they leave immigration detention. I primarily used qualitative interviewing to develop a rich account of participants' post-detention lives. I also attempted to include a visual research strategy called 'photo-voice' which involved the distribution of digital cameras to a sample of participants as or once they left detention. The aim with photo-voice was to offer insight into how detention impacts individuals upon their return 'home' (in the UK or in another country) using a different medium to capture and express such experiences (see, e.g., Wang et al. 2000; Fitzgibbon and Stengel 2017). The follow-up interviews focused on how participants were coping with their situations and daily life after detention, how they experienced release or deportation, how they felt about the UK based on their experiences of detention and release or deportation, and their hopes for the future. As I detail more below, I used social media to keep in touch with participants and as a potential source of data.

The majority of participants were men (n=15, compared to n=6 women) and most were in their twenties and thirties. Their countries of origin were located primarily in South Asia and Africa as well as the Caribbean, Middle East, and South America. The UK-based participants were in the community on immigration bail or temporary admission while awaiting determination of their immigration cases—most of which involved asylum applications or appeals against deportation under the European Convention on Human Rights. Among those who were

expelled from the UK, the vast majority were administratively removed, meaning that their removal was for administrative rather than criminal reasons.[1]

In practical terms, I maintained contact with participants to carry out the follow-up research by using a variety of means. The primary mechanisms were email, telephone, and text message, but I also used social media platforms like Skype, Facebook, and LinkedIn. I found it prudent to be available on multiple platforms, so this meant using my research telephone and having publicly oriented Facebook and LinkedIn profiles. Using social media to carry out the research and drawing on visual methods like photo-voice were part of my methodological approach which aimed to be 'innovative' and generate new techniques for connecting with difficult to reach and marginalised populations.

The challenges of follow-up research

In what follows, I detail three interrelated challenges I encountered whilst conducting follow-up research with former detainees: ethical, logistical, and the researcher-participant relationship.

Ethical dilemmas and challenges

Bosworth (2014), Bosworth and Kellezi (2017), and Maillet et al. (2017) have considered some of the ethical challenges of undertaking fieldwork in immigration detention centres. Much more has been written about ethical issues in research with refugees and asylum seekers (Darling

[1] Under UK law, administrative removal and deportation are separate legal processes and categories, although both involve the expulsion of individuals to another country and restrictions on re-entry (ranging from one year to ten years' duration). Deportation applies specifically to individuals who are subject to expulsion due to their criminal convictions. However, in this chapter, deportation is used throughout to denote the forced removal of a migrant from a state's territory.

2014; Block et al. 2012; Hugman et al. 2011a) and migrants more generally (Coutin and Vogel 2016). Some scholars have argued that the vulnerabilities of certain migrants are so great that researchers must go beyond the trope of 'do no harm' in order to protect participants and forge ethical research relationships (Mackenzie et al. 2007; Hugman et al. 2011b).

In terms of ethical concerns, I found that detention and its aftermath created conditions of vulnerability for participants. Even after release, most suffered from some form of psychological distress associated with the experience of confinement, which was then compounded by the uncertainty related to the impending outcomes of their immigration cases or their experiences of deportation. These factors and circumstances raise important ethical considerations as to how much and what to ask of participants. It also requires trying to find a balance between care and empathy with the research goals, while at the same time not infantilising people through the label of vulnerability (Maillet et al. 2017) nor giving them false expectations about my reasons for following up with them (e.g., that I could offer legal or other forms of assistance). It was not always easy to find or maintain such a balance.

Unfortunately, the research goals do not always fit nicely to the reality of researching a difficult subject with a marginalised population. For instance, I was unable to undertake the photo-voice component of the research because nearly all of the participants were not able to contribute photos as would have been conducive to the research goals in terms of producing 'data.' Most informants did not return my emails, texts, or phone calls about their photographs. One participant told me that he did not want to document his life after deportation because it felt too personal for him and he was concerned at being portrayed as a powerless 'victim' of the UK immigration system. Such difficulties in pursuing this particular research method often led me to question what the point of the project was, for when many participants were just trying to survive and I could not do anything to help them, other than be someone to talk to and offer a small honorarium of £15 for their participation.

Reaching out to participants to follow-up with them sometimes felt awful, raising ethical dilemmas when their replies yielded upsetting or troubling information. For example, I received the following email back from Chris (early twenties, deported to South Asia) after I had approached him with the goal of setting up a follow-up interview:

> Hi Sarah :)
>
> Thanks for your concern and the email. Just living my life and facing new problems every new day as life so hard for me ATM [at the moment]. Away from family can't go to them can't see them often this life is not less than a hell for me. Don't know what to do and hard to survive as I don't have job even wanted to do but I can't :(
>
> I don't know what will British government will get to send me back I just asked from them my life nothing else [sad face emojis] now I don't have place to live oh my god tbh [to be honest] Sarah if life is going to treat me like this better I commit suicide I don't wanna live in this world like this :(
>
> [Chris] (email, 18 September 2014)

This email made me question how far to push the research relationship and for what ultimate goal, especially when I was thousands of kilometres away and unable to offer any real support or assistance. Who could I have contacted for help if Chris was really suicidal? Was I (re)traumatising him by asking him how his life was like after being deported from the UK? The formal mechanisms put in place by university ethics review boards or the guidance provided by academic associations tend not to cover these sorts of remote research encounters, necessitating instead what Guillemin and Gillam (2004) call 'ethics in practice.' This means making 'on the ground' decisions that uphold ethical commitments as best as possible. In this case, I could only reply to Chris' email to encourage him to take care of himself and seek help

if he was distressed, while deciding not to pursue a follow-up interview. As with Brent, I did not know what to say.

The logistics of communicating across time and space

For the follow-up research with UK-based participants, the logistical challenges of geographic distance were more easily overcome, requiring longer train journeys and a rare overnight stay at a hotel. The benefit of such research trips allowed, at first, for some snowball sampling so that I was able to interview former detainees who I had not first met during my fieldwork at the four IRCs. The logistical challenges of time were somewhat more difficult to contend with as this required drawing on the relationships that I had made 'inside' before we lost touch once participants were 'outside.' This involved allowing informants enough time to 'adjust' to life after detention while respecting their emotional and practical needs, such as decompressing after often long periods of detention (and occasionally imprisonment), finding shelter and food, figuring out new routines, reporting to the Home Office, and so forth.

The remote follow-up research was difficult to carry out in other ways. Depending on where people ended up, some did not have access to the internet and/or it was expensive to make and receive calls. For instance, several interviews and conversations held over Skype or the telephone suffered from patchy, unreliable connections. Social media helped somewhat but there are also issues of boundaries including the line between research and personal relationships and the location of 'the field' (Luh Sin 2015). For instance, like Luh Sin (2015), through 'friending' participants on Facebook, I was provided access to their lives in ways they perhaps had not imagined nor to which they had consented. Although convenient in many regards, the use of social media may make boundaries of researcher-participant relationships

blurrier, even as I used professional (not personal) accounts in order to present my researcher 'front.'[2]

As with the in-detention fieldwork, my gender (in its intersection with my race, age, nationality, sexuality, and ability) also became a 'logistical issue' (see Billo and Hiemstra 2013: 323) during the follow-up research, shaping how I conducted the fieldwork. For instance, in addition to confirming the usual safeguards, it required managing the researcher-participant relationship in an attempt to ensure that research trips within the UK and the follow-up correspondence were not misinterpreted by participants as anything beyond the research and that my expression of empathy or concern was part of the researcher-participant relationship. As I next show, managing these relationships was especially challenging.

The messy boundaries of the researcher-participant relationship

Qualitative methods, like interviews and participant observation, 'rely heavily upon interpersonal encounters; the very interaction between researcher and informant creates data' (Maillet et al. 2017: 942). Following up with participants requires that such interpersonal encounters continue to occur over time and geographic distance in order to build and maintain the researcher-participant relationship. Through the act of creating relationships and following up with my informants, a key challenge was continually drawing and redrawing the (artificial) boundaries around 'researcher' and 'participant' (Fraser and Puwar 2008) as well as being cognisant of the attendant 'asymmetrical power relations' (Maillet et al. 2017: 928). Yet,

[2] On the other hand, using a professional Facebook account, for example, often felt disingenuous to participants who shared their personal profiles with me (see also Lin Suh 2015). This is not to say that participants are not capable of being savvy users of social media, but rather that seemingly simple acts of 'friending' (by either making or accepting friend requests) participants are not without ethical considerations nor reflective of asymmetrical relations of power.

various 'research intimacies' (Fraser and Puwar 2008) accompany these relationships, requiring navigation across gender, racial, cultural, religious, national, and linguistic differences (e.g., Phillips and Earle 2010; Phillips 2012) while getting to know the participants through the project. Such research also demanded a certain degree of reciprocity such that I also had to give something of myself, whether this was about my interests, hobbies, or family life (Darling 2014). Darling (2014: 204) terms these sorts of issues 'emotional entanglements,' highlighting both the affective and challenging nature of research relationships and the fieldwork experience.

I learned that for some participants who were very marginalised and distressed, I remained one person who remembered them and would answer their texts, calls, or emails. This often occurred in a context where they had lost friendships and family relationships through their detention and, in some cases, their deportation. For several informants, I was their only remaining connection to the UK that was still in communication with them. In talking about detention, release, and/or deportation, I was also someone who could understand, often better than their friends and family, what detention was like and the impacts it has had on their lives. This frequently occurred for male participants who did not want to look 'weak' in front of their (female) partners or families. With such researcher-participant relationships, my role was often one of witness to their loss and suffering.

In other instances, participants looked to me for help out of their predicaments, but there was nothing I could practicably do to help them other than to be someone they could talk to—a witness—which connects back to key ethical considerations and the research goals as the project was not intended to (nor could) provide practical assistance. At times it was difficult for me to balance my empathy and desire to interact ethically with participants and treat them with care and respect while collecting 'data' in the context of a time-sensitive research project.

So in reaching out to people to follow-up, I had to draw on and continually build relationships with people whilst being mindful of all of these challenges. I was not always successful and several of these relationships caused me a lot of (di)stress. For instance, in the excerpt below of a chat on Facebook Messenger with Eshan (early twenties, South Asia), I was trying to find out how things were going for him as he waited in the UK community for a resolution to his immigration case. I had met him previously for an in-person follow-up interview but used Facebook Messenger to maintain contact.

> Me: How are things going?
>
> Eshan: Just ok
>
> Me: What's happening?
>
> Eshan: Miss you
>
> Me: Can you say what's happening for you?
>
> Eshan: Nothing
>
> Me: Are you still living at the same place in London?
>
> Eshan: Yes. do you miss me Sarah?
>
> (chat via Facebook Messenger, 3 June 2014)

Through this exchange, I was frustrated at Eshan's attempt to make me answer his question ('do you miss me?') because it veered the conversation out of my comfort zone and away from the 'ideal' (not messy) research-participant relationship I was trying to maintain. His question invoked intimacy and recognition, revealing how gender, heteronormativity, and sexuality are interwoven in such research relationships, even as we may try to deny or minimise them (see Kaspar and Landolt 2016). I did not want to hurt his feelings by answering the question ('no, I

do not'), even as I could appreciate and understand what I interpreted as his request to be recognised. At the same time, I felt burnt out and lacked the emotional and intellectual energy to deal with the situation by addressing his comments directly. I have no doubt that researchers face similar responses when trying to 'recruit' and 'retain' participants. However, we rarely talk about the gendered and sexualised aspects of fieldwork, especially in criminology, perhaps because they are embarrassing, difficult to articulate, or do not fit with positivist constructions of 'the field' and research itself as if it is 'a linear, pristine, ordered process' (Valentine 2001: 43). It is often not easy to address the gendered and sexualised dimensions of research as this risks appearing weak, inappropriate, or simply unable to professionally handle the complexities of fieldwork (Billo and Hiemstra 2013; Kaspar and Landolt 2016).

As the follow-up research progressed, my role as researcher was forgotten or conveniently ignored by some participants. It required me to reassert my researcher positionality while some tried to bend the not-so-clear boundaries of the researcher-participant relationship in the direction of 'friend' or potential 'love interest,' with me trying to steer my position back towards 'friendly researcher.' The 'emotional entanglements' (Darling 2014) of such relationships were particularly difficult to navigate across various lines of difference (e.g., gender, culture, education, and language) while being respectful of people's feelings and trying to capture the intricacies and messiness of research relationships. It was hard, for instance, to explain that I could care about a participant as an empathetic human being and not just for the sake of the research. Such entanglements led me to end two researcher-participant relationships with male participants because I felt I could no longer ethically manage them.

Like Darling (2014: 208), I was also unprepared for participants' expectations of me as a 'privileged citizen' (albeit Canadian, not British) who could possibly effect change through my social and cultural capital. I had been cognisant of my positionality (i.e., white, English-speaking, heterosexual, able-bodied woman) as I entered and worked in 'the field,' but not in

relation to what I could be expected to do to 'help.' Such requests ranged from the extreme (e.g., a proposal of marriage to help resolve the participant's lack of regularised status; an appeal for a £500 loan), which I declined, to the more mundane (e.g., guidance on Canada's immigration system), which I did my best to assist. Such expectations and requests were challenging to deal with on an emotional level yet were also revealing of the entanglements that characterise researcher-participant relationships and their unequal relations of power. They were, however, a good reminder that such 'relationships are continually negotiated during fieldwork' (McCorkel and Myers 2003: 204), particularly those that are formed and maintained over time.

Overcoming challenges, identifying opportunities

In addition to the interconnected challenges of ethics, logistics, and interpersonal relationships, the follow-up research itself was emotionally difficult for me, eliciting feelings of sadness, anger, guilt, shame, and anxiety. It was hard to manage participants' stories of suffering, loss, depression, hardship, suicidal ideation, anger, and injustice. Put simply, I became personally affected by participants' lived experiences of border control. It took some time and distance before I could recognise and respect their resilience and agency, seeing them as human beings in their entirety rather than solely in terms of suffering and loss. As others have argued, it is important to identify and attend to the emotional implications of research (Darling 2014; Elmhirst 2012; Bosworth and Kellezi 2017; Billo and Hiemstra 2013; Wakeman 2014). Darling (2014: 205) argues that 'emotional engagement must be considered as central in the *practice* of research.' Emotions thus are not peripheral but shape the choices we make and how we engage with 'the field' (Darling 2014; Wakeman 2014).

Importantly, concerns around vicarious trauma while undertaking social science research is garnering increased attention (see Gerlach, this volume; Drozdzewski and Dominey-Howes

2015). After completing 149 days of in-detention fieldwork over the course of one year, I had experienced vicarious traumatisation and was emotionally and intellectually fatigued. However, at the time, I was not yet aware of the deep impacts of the first phase of the research and had already started the follow-up component in an attempt to maintain the research relationships I had established with former detainees before the complications of time and geographic distance got in the way. I also did not expect how going through my data—the interview transcripts and my fieldnotes—for analysis and writing-up would bring up challenging emotions and feelings again, affecting me once more.

As Billo and Hiemstra (2013: 322) argue, 'a researcher must be better at reconciling any fieldwork ideal with the reality of what you can personally do and what is sustainable for you.' Being reflexive thus requires attending to one's 'own needs, abilities, and emotions' and recognising that 'the material constellations encountered in the field can also influence a researcher's positionality' (Billo and Hiemstra 2013: 322). Working through such challenges requires identifying and talking about them. This is not mere self-indulgence but an important aspect for making sense of the data and how the researcher's own subjectivity and positionality shape the research and the production of knowledge. Indeed, the recognition of research and research relationships as situated and embedded 'facilitates the emergence of more nuanced understandings of the realities of everyday lives and practice[s]' (Case and Haines 2014: 59).

With the difficulties of fieldwork come opportunities for understanding the intricate workings of criminal justice and penal power in an era of mass mobility. Even as the follow-up fieldwork was challenging, it has provided a glimpse into the lived experiences of life after immigration detention and the emotional and interpersonal impacts of border control in contemporary Britain. My own experience of upset at participants' situations and stories also illuminates how oppressive and trying these forms of state power are to contend with. The fact that certain methods (i.e., photo-voice) did not 'work' as expected provides important information as to the

limits of what can reasonably be expected of research participants, particularly those in situations characterised by significant uncertainty, precarity, and/or hardship.

The use of social media to maintain research relationships proved useful although much more thought needs to be paid to the benefits and limitations of new forms of communication and engagement in relation to research methodologies and ethics (Luh Sin 2015). Although social media platforms like Facebook open up new possibilities for conducting research with increasingly mobile research populations, it is possible that they may also intensify the likelihood of misunderstandings or misdirection in researcher-participant relationships, such as in the Messenger chat with Eshan discussed earlier. This may be the case especially if, as I suggest, these platforms are more likely to invite greater intimacy or expressions of emotion than more 'traditional' methods like semi-structure interviews in person or over the telephone. Consequently, as I have learned, in the rush to use 'innovative' methods as part of time-sensitive research projects, the ethical and practical implications of social media should be given adequate consideration, especially in advance of their use.

Concluding thoughts

This chapter offered a critical discussion of, and reflection upon, some of the challenges and opportunities of doing community-based and remote follow-up research with former immigration detainees about life after detention. In particular, it highlighted issues of ethics, logistics, and researcher-participant relationships as three key, interconnected challenges that shaped the collection of data and my own interactions with, and experience of, 'the field.' Such challenges point to the inherent messiness of the research process and the importance of attending to the emotional and interpersonal difficulties that accompany fieldwork. I concur with Bosworth (2014) and Maillet et al. (2017) that such research on border control is important even as it is often difficult to undertake. However, it is important for researchers to think

critically about what can reasonably be asked (or expected) of participants whose lives are increasingly precarious through state efforts to (im)mobilise and expel.

At the time of writing, I am still working on the analysis and writing-up of my research. As such, I continue to grapple with these issues and others that I have not had the space to discuss here, such as whiteness, the possibility of feminist and anti-racist research praxis in criminological research on detention and deportation, and the ethics of presenting participants' stories of suffering and loss (see Coutin and Vogel 2016). I hope this chapter offers something useful for researchers who are exploring related issues and employing similar methodologies.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the women and men who participated in this research project and shared their thoughts and experiences with me. I also thank the Home Office and IRC centre managers for granting research access. This work was generously supported by Mary Bosworth's European Research Council Starting Grant (no. 313362). Thanks to Ines Hasselberg, Alpa Parmar, Synnøve Økland Jahnsen, Rebecca Powell, and Andriani Fili for reading and commenting on earlier drafts of this chapter.

References

Aas, K.F. and Bosworth, M. (eds.) (2013) *The Borders of Punishment: Migration, Citizenship, and Social Exclusion*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Billo, E. and Hiemstra, N. (2013) 'Mediating messiness: Expanding ideas of flexibility, reflexivity, and embodiment in fieldwork,' *Gender, Place & Culture*, 20: 313-328.

Block, K., Warr, D., Gibbs, L. and Riggs, E. (2012) 'Addressing ethical and methodological challenges in research with refugee-background young people: Reflections from the field,' *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 26: 69-87.

Bosworth, M. (2014) *Inside Immigration Detention*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. (2016) 'Mental health in immigration detention: A literature review,' *Criminal Justice, Borders and Citizenship Research Paper Series*. Available: http://ssrn.com/abstract=2732892 [Accessed 6 March 2016].

Bosworth, M. and Kellezi, B. (2017) 'Doing research in immigration removal centres: Ethics, emotions and impact,' *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 17: 121-137.

Bosworth, M. and Turnbull, S. (2015) 'Immigration detention and the expansion of penal power in the United Kingdom,' in K. Reiter and A. Koenig (eds.) *Extreme Punishment: Comparative Studies in Detention, Incarceration and Solitary Confinement*, pp. 50-67, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Case, S. and Haines, K. (2014) 'Reflective friend research: The relational aspects of social scientific research,' in K. Lumsden and A. Winter (eds.) *Reflexivity in Criminological Research: Experiences with the Powerful and the Powerless*, pp. 58-74, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Coutin, S.B. and Vogel, E. (2016) 'Migrant narratives and ethnographic tropes: Navigating tragedy, creating possibilities,' *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 45: 631-644.

Darling, J. (2014) 'Emotions, encounters and expectations: The uncertain ethics of "the field,"' *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 6: 201-212.

De Genova, N.P. (2002) 'Migrant "illegality" and deportability in everyday life,' *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31: 419-447.

Drozdzewski, D. and Dominey-Howes, D. (2015) 'Research and trauma: Understanding the impact of traumatic content and places on the researcher,' *Emotion, Space and Society*, 17: 17-21.

Elmhirst, R. (2012) 'Methodological dilemmas in migration research in Asia: Research design, omissions and strategic erasures,' *Area*, 44: 274-281.

England, K. (1994) 'Getting personal: Reflexivity, positionality, and feminist research,' *The Professional Geographer*, 46: 80-89.

Faria, C. and Mollett, S. (2016) 'Critical feminist reflexivity and the politics of whiteness in the "field,"' *Gender, Place & Culture*, 23: 79-93.

Fitzgibbon, W. and Stengel, C. (2017) 'Women's voices made visible: Photovoice in visual criminology,' *Punishment & Society*, epub before print 28 March 2017 doi:10.1177/1462474517700137.

Fraser, M. and Puwar, N. (2008) 'Introduction: Intimacy in research,' *History of the Human Sciences*, 21: 1-16.

Golash-Boza, T. (2015) *Deported: Immigrant Policing, Disposable Labor, and Global Capitalism*, New York: New York University Press.

Guillemin M. and Gillam, L. (2004) 'Ethics, reflexivity, and "ethically important moments" in research,' *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10: 261-280.

Hasselberg, I. (2016) *Enduring Uncertainty: Deportation, Punishment and the Everyday Life*, Oxford: Berghahn.

Hugman, R., Bartolomei, L. and Pittaway, E. (2011a) 'Human agency and the meaning of informed consent: Reflections on research with refugees,' *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 24: 655-671.

Hugman, R., Pittaway, E. and Bartolomei, L. (2011b) 'When "do no harm" is not enough: The ethics of research with refugees and other vulnerable groups,' *British Journal of Social Work*, 41: 1271-1287.

Jazeel, T. and McFarlane, C. (2010) 'The limits of responsibility: A postcolonial politics of academic knowledge production,' *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 35: 109-124.

Jones, H., Bhattacharyya, G., Davies, W., Dhaliwal, S., Forkert, K., Gunaratnam, Y., Jackson, E. and Saltus, R. (2015) *Go Home: Mapping the Unfolding Controversy of Home Office Immigration Campaigns*, Warwick: University of Warwick.

Kaspar, H. and Landolt, S. (2016) 'Flirting in the field: Shifting positionalities and power relations in innocuous sexualisations of research encounters,' *Gender, Place & Culture*, 23: 107-119.

Luh Sin, H. (2015) '"You're not doing work, you're on Facebook!": Ethics of encountering the field through social media,' *The Professional Geographer*, 67: 676-685.

Lumsden, K. and Winter, A. (eds.) (2014) *Reflexivity in Criminological Research: Experiences with the Powerful and the Powerless*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

MacKenzie, C., McDowell, C. and Pittaway, E. (2007) 'Beyond "do no harm": The challenge of constructing ethical relationships in refugee research,' *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20: 299-319.

Maillet, P., Mountz, A. and Williams, K. (2017) 'Researching migration and enforcement in obscured places: Practical, ethical and methodological challenges to fieldwork,' *Social & Cultural Geography*, 18: 927-950.

McCorkel, J.A. and Myers, K. (2003) 'What difference does difference make? Position and privilege in the field,' *Qualitative Sociology*, 26: 199-231.

Phillips, C. (2012) *The Multicultural Prison: Ethnicity, Masculinity, and Social Relations Among Prisoners*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillips, C. and Earle, R. (2010) 'Reading difference differently?: Identity, epistemology and prison ethnography,' *British Journal of Criminology*, 50: 360-378.

Schuster, L. and Majidi, N. (2013) 'What happens post-deportation? The experience of deported Afghans,' *Migration Studies*, 1: 221-240.

Turnbull, S. (forthcoming) 'Starting again: Life after deportation from the United Kingdom,' in S. Khosravi (ed.) *After Deportation,* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Turnbull, S. (2016) '"Stuck in the middle": Waiting and uncertainty in immigration detention,' *Time & Society*, 25: 61-79.

Turnbull, S. and Hasselberg, I. (2017) 'From prison to detention: The carceral trajectories of foreign-national prisoners in the United Kingdom,' *Punishment & Society*, 19: 135-154.

Valentine, G. (2001) 'At the drawing board: Developing a research design,' in M. Limb and C. Dwyer (eds.) *Qualitative Methodologies for Geographers: Issues and Debates*, pp. 41-54, London: Hodder Arnold.

Wakeman, S. (2014) 'Fieldwork, biography and emotion: Doing criminological autoethnography,' *British Journal of Criminology*, 54: 705-721.

Wang, C., Cash, J. and Powers, L. (2000) 'Who knows the streets as well as the homeless? Promoting personal and community action through photovoice,' *Health Promotion Practice*, 1: 81-89.

Williams, L. (2015) 'From immigration detention to destitution,' *Criminal Justice Matters*, 99: 12-13.